First of all let me share with you the results of the vote--a majority has asked that we have separate elections for Spielman and Boyer.

Since that is a central issue, I will proceed in this memo to suggest what the ground rules might be for the February division meeting at which we will vote on nominees submitted in writing in the days before February 19th.

It is important to note that even though what follows attempts to be sensitive to various concerns already expressed by members of the division, it is in no way final. I will encourage you to consider what follows and send me comments as you see fit.

Toward the end of J-Term I will send out a "final" statement, perhaps with an area or two of concern which we would need to settle via a vote. My hope is that this will allow us to create and publish well before the February meeting a procedure that has been agreed to by a substantial majority of the division.

The procedures might involve the following:

1) distribution of nomination papers (bios on one or two sheets of paper) a week or so before February 19th;

2) each program/department should limit its nominations to one student per scholarship award (some have suggested that the limit should apply to one nomination period such that we would have only two or three nominees for each award. I sense that many of you would find that too restrictive, that is, many programs/departments would want to nominate two students, one for each award);

3) a student may be nominated for only ONE award and may not be "switched" to the other election if she does not win the first award;

4) the two slates will be distinguished by the Spielman's emphasis on leadership outside the classroom and Boyer's emphasis on leadership inside the classroom. (I realize that this distinction caused us problems in the spring of 1996 such that we decided to place all nominees in one election and select the two students with the most votes. Since we voted for two elections this time, we need to figure out a separate set of criteria for the Boyer Award. I am open to suggestions if you find the above problematic;

5) at the meeting, nominations would be open for Spielman and after brief supporting statements and questions or comments from the floor, we would proceed with the vote, majority rules; we would then use the same process to select the Boyer Scholarship recipient;

6) absentee ballots would be allowed but would be counted only as long as the nominee receiving the vote remains on the ballot;

I am sure this does not cover all the details, but at least it provides a framework within which to function.

Feel free to send me suggested revisions. A final vote, if that is needed, will not take place until the beginning of the spring semester.

Bill